

Illinois Report Card Project

Meeting: Steering Committee Meeting

Date: May 2, 2011

Participants: Amy Nowell (CPS), Ann Courter (UIC), Ben Boer (Advance Illinois), Colleen Donovan (BCG), Dan Brown (ISBE), Dan Harris (Ounce of Prevention), Kathy Ryg (Voices/P-20 Family & Community Outreach), Larry Frank (IEA/NEA), Marin Gjaja (BCG), Max McGee (IMSA/P20 Council), Melissa Mitchell (Fed. Of Community Schools), Michael Jacoby (IASBO), Michelle Russell (BCG), Rich Voltz (IASA), Robin Steans (AI/P20 Council), Shalini Unnikrishnan (BCG), Steve Pearson (Advance Illinois)

Topics of discussion: progress and P-20 council meeting update; v0.1 report card design assumptions and metrics; preliminary focus group research plan

Summary of discussion:

- Steering Committee reviewed progress and key themes from P-20 council meeting presentation
 - One-on-one discussions have taken place with Steering Committee members, select Advisory Committee members, and additional education experts
 - Benchmarking conducted to compare metrics in report card v0.1 to state and city report card benchmarks
 - At P-20 Council meeting, Robin Steans, Max McGee and BCG team introduced report card project, including view on report cards, pyramid logic, project deliverables, guiding questions, approach and workplan
 - Council emphasized importance of stakeholder engagement to success
 - Team clarified that at current stage, scope of report cards is K-12
- Report card design assumptions discussed and agreed to
 - Five separate report cards to be designed to address majority of schools, recognizing additional report cards will be needed for various grade-level configurations. Members emphasized importance of including grade levels alongside school names given varying uses. v0.1 report cards include:
 - High school (grades 9-12)
 - Junior high (grades 7-8)
 - Middle school (grades 5-6)
 - Elementary school (grades PK/K-4)
 - District
 - Suggestion made to use 'Late elementary' and 'Primary elementary' instead of 'Junior High,' 'Middle school' and 'Elementary' – team will incorporate this into v0.2
 - One-pager will ideally have 10-15 metrics with a cover page for additional context characteristics
 - Committee agreed maintaining discipline around 10-15 metrics is important to ensure user-friendly; some interested in only 8-10 metrics
 - One-pager will only communicate metrics at the 'overall school' level
 - Detailed report will include metric breakdowns by demographic groups, socioeconomic levels; will also consider including breakdowns by performance level (e.g. high-performing and low-performing)
 - District report card will not simply be a roll-up of schools' metrics; will also include metrics relevant for district (e.g. management metrics)
 - District card to be developed once initial alignment reached on school

- Question raised whether report card will include comparisons (e.g. to peers, district average, etc) – agreement that current focus is on the metrics and we will address the question of 'display' in the next Steering Committee meeting
- Steering Committee discussed report card guiding questions and sub-categories and, in some cases, refined
 - Outcomes: Are students achieving quality outcomes?
 - *Sub-categories:* Graduation/ promotion to next level; Readiness for next level; Success in the next level
 - Progress: Are students making progress toward quality outcomes?
 - *Sub-categories:* On track; Performance; Gains
 - Within Performance, Committee emphasized need to separate meets and exceeds; cannot solely report % of students meeting + exceeding
 - Climate: Is the climate conducive to enabling quality outcomes and progress?
 - *Sub-categories:* Academic environment & engagement; Safety
 - Committee asked to adjust name of guiding question and sub-categories with goal of communicating broader survey and specific sections of a student and teacher survey (e.g. coherent curriculum, strong and professional climate, etc); team will adjust names in v0.2
 - Safety – Committee acknowledged importance of relative safety; suggestion to address by including question comparing safety of school vs. home, vs. neighborhood
 - Context characteristics: What are the characteristics of the school/ district that provide relevant context?
 - *Sub-categories:* Student; Teacher; Administration
 - Committee asked to adjust name of 'Context characteristics' on one-pager to more clearly distinguish vs. those items included on cover page; team will adjust guiding question name in v0.2
- Steering Committee reviewed high school report card v0.1
 - Reviewed both the 'ideal' and 'proposed' high school report cards, recognizing some trade-offs had to be made for 'proposed' card due to data availability and feasibility; each metric was discussed and modifications were suggested
 - Outcomes
 - Readiness
 - Committee prefers reporting '% of students meeting ACT college & career readiness threshold' on a composite basis rather than per-subject basis given concerns with Science and English thresholds; need to align on specific threshold (20, 21?)
 - In future meeting, will discuss timing of report card release as will impact which 11th and 12th grade scores are included (current year or prior year)
 - Course-taking behavior (e.g. % of students taking courses beyond Algebra II or advanced science) suggested as alternative, but Committee aligned that this is not possible in near-term given would require significant policy changes (e.g. state vs. district control over curriculum)
 - Meeting IL Jr College thresholds suggested as alternative, but Committee aligned that these are not as well-known as ACT thresholds and may not be aligned with 4 yr college standards
 - Committee also highly interested in reporting career readiness
 - Concern that students intending to enter career immediately after college do not take ACT seriously

- To resolve this, could have breakdown in detailed report: % college ready; % not college-ready, but work-ready; % not college nor career ready
 - No agreement on which assessment to use to assess career readiness and whether WorkKeys will be used in long-term
 - Team will follow up with P20 School, College, and Career Readiness committee to resolve
 - A concern about WorkKeys is that students have no accountability to perform well on it
 - 'Avg. # of vocational training courses taken by vocational student' suggested as alternative metric
 - Success
 - While an aspiration, team aligned that current data systems and privacy laws do not allow for accurate tracking of whether HS graduates are employed
 - Though no current system/ capacity to track whether HS graduates enrolling in post-secondary graduate from post-secondary, Committee suggested using remediation rates as proxy for success in post-secondary
 - Remediation rates should be available in HS feedback report in 1-2 yrs
 - Progress
 - On track – Committee decided HS report card should report '% of Freshman on track' given vast majority of high schools begin in 9th grade; (lower schools will report '% of students in school's lowest grade on track')
 - AP – Committee debated whether AP metric should be included and, if yes, how it should be reported; agreed to address topic again in Advisory Committee meeting
 - Reasons for not including AP metric included: perceived to overlap with college & career readiness metric; burdensome cost of AP exams; disadvantages small schools or schools with high % of special education students
 - Others argued that an AP class metric helps demonstrate a school's commitment to academic rigor; further, highlighting limited access to AP classes is important so should not shy away from reporting
 - Reporting options included: '% of students scoring ≥ 3 on at least 1 AP, IB, or dual credit/enrollment test;' both enrollment in advanced classes and performance on advanced exams; # of AP courses offered (appearing in 'Context characteristics')
 - Committee noted a performance metric would need to acknowledge varying score thresholds for IB and dual credit/enrollment exams
 - Committee agreed gains metric should be 'under construction' until available
 - Climate (*to be renamed per earlier notes*)
 - Original recommendation was to include student, teacher, and parent responses to climate survey questions, but Committee voiced concern about parent survey; team will remove for v0.2
 - Parents not included in Senate Bill 7, which could cause issue in ensuring a uniform parent survey across the state
 - Adequate parent response rate will be difficult to achieve

- Few parent surveys conducted today, meaning there is limited research to compare survey responses to/ draw conclusions from
 - Recognizing parent engagement is an important element, Committee agreed survey would gather perceptions of parent & community engagement from students, teachers
 - Committee agreed parent survey can be aspiration for future
- Context characteristics (*to be renamed per earlier notes*)
 - Teacher characteristics discussed at length
 - Agreed teacher retention is important metric to include
 - Must provide proper context – some turnover is healthy
 - Agreed goal should be to include '% of teachers in each evaluation bucket' (according to new evaluation system) when available, but debate over interim metric; proposed interim metric was '% of teachers nationally board certified'; will address topic again in Advisory Committee meeting
 - Some suggested teacher attendance as more important
 - Question raised whether teacher attendance should be interim metric to be substituted by teacher evaluation metric in future or whether it would be additional metric
 - Some concern that teacher attendance is highly correlated with teacher climate survey response rate, meaning this would be a duplicate metric
 - Agreed current teacher evaluation system cannot be used due to lack of objective elements; new evaluation system will include objective element via student performance
 - Administration – some concern that 3 yrs is too short for a metric regarding Principal turnover ('# of different principals at school in past 3 yrs'); team agreed to investigate time period further
- Due to time constraints, Committee did not review Junior High, Middle School, and Elementary report cards or list of context characteristics on front page of report card
 - Noted that 'Climate' and 'Context characteristics' metrics are consistent across all school level report cards with exception of middle and elementary school report cards excluding student survey responses
 - All SC members requested to review independently and send feedback to team
- Briefly reviewed focus group research plan
 - Key stakeholders to include in focus groups: parents, students, teachers, principals, district or state administration, broader community key constituents
 - Committee agreed that we may need to host some mixed groups (e.g. teachers + principals) when more convenient
 - Group structure: ideal group sizes 5-8, maximum of 10-12
 - Selection criteria: goal to capture representative sample of districts; recommendation to approach based on geography, but also potential to include socio-economic factors; must ensure speaking with parents beyond those who are highly engaged
 - Recommended to include groups from Mount Vernon, Quad Cities, Kane County (9 unit districts w/ highly engaged principals and administrators)
 - Sequence/ timing: scheduled from mid July (primarily principals, teachers, administrators) to end August (parents)
 - Coordination and implementation: focus groups to be led by members of Steering/ Advisory Committees or other relevant community leaders; P-20 council committee,

'Family, Youth, and Community Engagement,' along with additional members will lead team to coordinate focus groups

- Committee requested to review focus group research plan independently and offer feedback on design principles and additional groups/ contacts to consider

Next steps

- **BCG team to incorporate Steering Committee input into report card v0.2 for discussion at Advisory Committee meeting on Friday, May 13**
- **BCG team to work with Family, Youth, and Community Engagement Committee to develop focus group research strategy further**
- **BCG team will send reminder to Steering Committee to provide feedback on Junior High, Middle School, and Elementary report cards, context characteristics, and focus group research plan; all feedback requested by Friday (5/6) at noon**